UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,226	05/31/2006	Franz Thoemmes	10191/4495	7534
26646 KENYON & K	7590 03/23/201 ENYON LLP	EXAMINER		
ONE BROADV	VAY	BOECKMANN, JASON J		
NEW YORK, NY 10004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3752	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/23/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/564,226	THOEMMES, FRANZ		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	JASON J. BOECKMANN	3752					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>11 March 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidaveal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abai it, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07( Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO				
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b  (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
<ul><li>4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li><li>5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li></ul>	·						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•	-				
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) abjected to:	☑ Will not be entered, or b) ☐ Will will ided below or appended.	ii be entered and an e	xpianation of				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>8,10 and 14-22</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10.  ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>							
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Len Tran/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3752	/J. J. B./ Examiner, Art Unit 3752 3/15/2010						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding the applicant's arguments concerning the 103 rejection of French as modified by Kobayashi, it is noted that the applicant argues that there is no apparent reason to increase the wall thickness of any portion of the valve sleeve of French because: it is fully capable of withstanding the pressures of the overmold unmodified as is, the overmold is already reinforced with element 70, and the overmold is not confined to the upper portion of the valve sleeve. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. First of all, the reason why the upper portion of the valve sleeve should have an increased thickness comes form the modifier reference Kobayashi (paragraph 37). Kobayashi teaches that the wall thickness is increased in order to help bear the remarkable pressures of the overmold. It is noted that the valve sleeve of French may be capable of withstanding these pressure of the overmold as is, but increasing the thickness will certainly help the valve sleeve in withstanding the pressures of the overmold. Secondly, it is noted that an increased wall thickness of the upper portion would help the valve sleeve withstand the pressures of the overmold even if it is reinforced by element 70. Lastly, the overmold only appears to be touching the valve sleeve at the upper portion and does not touch the valve sleeve anywhere but the upper portion in the French injector. Therefore, increasing only the wall thickness of the upper portion of the valve sleeve would certainly help it withstand the high pressures of the overmold.

2